

Remarks

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1, 53-65 and 80-85 are amended herein. Claims 74-79 have been canceled herein. Claims 1-11, 15-73 and 80-85 are pending.

5

Statement of Substance of Interview Dated 8/9/2007

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Robert Timblin for conducting a telephonic interview with Applicant's attorney, Daniel T. McGinnity, on 8/9/2007.

During the interview, Applicant's attorney submitted differences between the cited references, Hu and Bush, and the claimed subject matter. In particular, the cited references lack at least "a management agent for each of the multiple data sources", and "calls for custom logic, from a custom logic source outside the identity integration system" as recited for example in claim 1. For at least this reason, Applicant submits that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation or obviousness for the pending claims.

Nevertheless, in the interest of expediting allowance of the application and without conceding the propriety of the rejection, Applicant's attorney proposed to amend each of the independent claims to further clarify claimed features. Applicant's attorney understood the Examiner to tentatively agree that the proposed amendments would overcome the outstanding rejections based on Hu in combination with Bush. The Examiner indicated that the proposed amendments

20

would need to be presented in writing and that the search would need to be updated.

Accordingly, the independent claims have been amended herein consistent with the interview. Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If any issues remain that would prevent the allowance of the application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issues.

Claim Objection

Claim 65 is objected to for a minor informality. *Office Action, p. 2* Appropriate correction is made herein. Accordingly, the objection has been obviated.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claim 80 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The Examiner indicates confusion as to whether the claim is a system claim or an apparatus. *Office Action, p. 3*. In the spirit of cooperation and without conceding the propriety of the rejection, claim 80 has been amended herein to clearly recite a computer-implemented method. Accordingly, the §112 rejection has been obviated.

35 U.S.C. §101 Rejections

Claim 53 and its respective dependent claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as directed to software per se. Appropriate correction is made herein. In particular claim 53 and its respective dependent claims have been amended to
5 recite an apparatus. Accordingly, the §101 rejections have been obviated.

Claim 61 and its respective dependent claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as directed to software per se. Appropriate correction is made herein. In particular claim 61 and its respective dependent claims have been amended to
10 recite an apparatus. Accordingly, the §101 rejections have been obviated.

Claim 74 and its respective dependent claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as directed to software per se. To simplify outstanding issues and without conceding the propriety of the rejection, claims 74-79 are canceled herein. Accordingly, the §101 rejections have been obviated.

Dependent claim 83 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as directed to software
15 per se. Appropriate correction is made herein. In particular, independent claim 82 (from which claim 83 depends) and its respective dependent claims has been amended to recite “computer readable storage media”. Accordingly, the §101 rejection has been obviated.

35 U.S.C. §102 and §103 Rejections

Claims 1-11,15-20, 22-26, 28-48, 50-52, 54, 58, 60 62-64, 66, 68-79 and 81-84 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Printed Patent Application No. 2004/0158746 to Hu et al. (hereinafter “Hu”).

Claims 21, 47-49, 53, 55-57, 59, 61, 65, 67 and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hu in view of U.S. Printed Patent Application No. 2002/0083012 to Bush et al. (hereinafter “Bush”). Applicant respectfully disagrees. The previous response dated 2/14/07 is incorporated fully by reference. The Applicant maintains that the claims are allowable for at least the reasons discussed therein.

Nevertheless, In the interest of expediting allowance of the subject application and without conceding the propriety of the rejections, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that an administrative password operation is performed to collectively update passwords of multiple data sources to a new password specified by a user. Support for the amendment may be found throughout the specification and drawings as filed, examples of which include at least: FIG. 4; p. 14 lines 13-23 (management agent); p. 9 lines 15-19 (custom logic); p. 16 lines 3-17 (password operations). For example:

Claim 1 as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold italics)

recites a method comprising:

- selecting multiple data sources connected to an identity integration system, wherein:
 - the identity integration system includes a management agent for each of the multiple data sources configured specifically for its respective data source to manage data communication between the identity integration system and each respective data source;
 - for at least some of the multiple data sources a management agent for the data source is configured with credentials to perform password management; and
 - for at least one of the multiple data sources a management agent for the data source calls for custom logic configured as code, from a custom logic source outside the identity integration system, to perform password management for the data source; and
- ***receiving a new password input by a user;*** and
- performing ***an administrative*** password operation on a password associated with each of the selected multiple data sources ***to collectively update each said password to the new password,*** wherein the password operation is performed using the identity integration system.

Thus, claim 1 as presently recited contemplates an administrative password operation performed collectively on multiple selected data sources. In contrast, Hu is directed at authentication and login techniques with respect to particular target computers. In other words, the login transaction occurs for a specific target computer and not for multiple selected data sources. Hu does not even describe collectively authenticating to the target computers, let alone collective administrative password operations. In fact, Hu in paragraphs [0030]-[0031] clearly describes individual passwords and user names associated with different target computers. Hu further describes selection of one target computer and login

that occurs individually to the selected computer. Thus, Hu is limited to techniques performed separately to login to different computers. Bush does not correct the above noted defects in Hu.

Applicant understood the Examiner as agreeing in the interview of 8/9/07 that Hu and Bush, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest administrative password operations performed collectively for passwords of multiple data sources. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable for at least these reasons and withdrawal of the §103 rejection is respectfully requested.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. Accordingly withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-11 and **15-52** depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record.

Each of the remaining independent claims 53, 61, 65, 80 and 82 recite features similar to claim 1 in varying terms and scope. For example:

Claim 53 as amended recites in part:

- a password inputter to determine a new password input by a user to associate with each designated accounts; and
- a password manager *to collectively manage passwords for the designated accounts by* requesting an update of a password associated with each designated account to the new password, *responsive to the user input.*

Claim 61 as amended recites in part:

- logic for communicating with the identity integration system, wherein:
 - the identity integration system is capable of **collectively updating a password on multiple data sources** that use various functions of password updating *responsive to input of a single new password by a user*;

Claim 65 as amended recites in part:

- a web application for producing a list of the accounts from the identity integration system, for allowing selection of at least some of the accounts, *for inputting by a user of a new password to cause the new password to be associated with each of the selected accounts*, and for requesting the identity integration system to *collectively update passwords on each of the selected accounts to the input new password*;

Claim 65 as amended recites in part:

- a web application for producing a list of the accounts from the identity integration system, for allowing selection of at least some of the accounts, *for inputting by a user of a new password to cause the new password to be associated with each of the selected accounts*, and for requesting the identity integration system to *collectively update passwords on each of the selected accounts to the input new password*;

Claim 80 as amended recites in part:

- *allowing input of a new password via the user interface selection device; and*
- *allowing input of a request to update old passwords associated with each of the selected accounts to the new password input via the user interface.*

Claim 82 as amended recites in part:

- *receiving a new password input by a user to cause the new password to be associated with each of the selected multiple data sources; and*
- *using the identity integration system to collectively update a password associated with each of the selected multiple data sources to the new password input by the user*

(emphasis added)

Thus, each of claims 53, 60, 65, 80 and 82 contemplates collective management/updating of passwords for multiple data sources. As discussed with respect to claim 1, the proposed combination of Hu and Bush does not disclose, teach or suggest collective password operations, updates, or administrative password management. Hu for example is directed at authentication and login techniques which occur individually to each of multiple target computers. However, authentication in Hu is not performed collectively. Accordingly, claims 53, 60, 65, 80 and 82 and their respective dependent claims are allowable based on similar reasoning and withdrawal of the §102 and §103 rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Application is in condition for allowance and the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the present application. Should any issue remain that prevents immediate issuance of the application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the unresolved issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/4/07

By: /Daniel T. McGinnity, #55444/

Daniel T. McGinnity

Reg. No. 55444

Attorney for Applicant

Sadler, Breen, Morasch & Colby, PS

422 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 424

Spokane, Washington 99201

Telephone: (509) 755-7257

Facsimile: (509) 755-7252